



저작자표시-변경금지 2.0 대한민국

이용자는 아래의 조건을 따르는 경우에 한하여 자유롭게

- 이 저작물을 복제, 배포, 전송, 전시, 공연 및 방송할 수 있습니다.
- 이 저작물을 영리 목적으로 이용할 수 있습니다.

다음과 같은 조건을 따라야 합니다:



저작자표시. 귀하는 원저작자를 표시하여야 합니다.



변경금지. 귀하는 이 저작물을 개작, 변형 또는 가공할 수 없습니다.

- 귀하는, 이 저작물의 재이용이나 배포의 경우, 이 저작물에 적용된 이용허락조건을 명확하게 나타내어야 합니다.
- 저작권자로부터 별도의 허가를 받으면 이러한 조건들은 적용되지 않습니다.

저작권법에 따른 이용자의 권리는 위의 내용에 의하여 영향을 받지 않습니다.

이것은 [이용허락규약\(Legal Code\)](#)을 이해하기 쉽게 요약한 것입니다.

[Disclaimer](#) 



교육학석사학위논문

Individual and System
in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

조지 오웰의 1984에 나타나는 개인과 체계

2014년 8월

서울대학교 대학원
외국어교육과 영어전공
류 수 아

Individual and System
in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

by
Su Ah Ryu

A Thesis Submitted to
the Department of Foreign Language Education
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Master of Arts in Education

At the
Graduate School of Seoul National University

August 2014

Individual and System
in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

조지 오웰의 1984에 나타나는 개인과 체계

지도교수 민 병 천

이 논문을 교육학 석사 학위논문으로 제출함

2014년 6월

서울대학교 대학원
외국어교육과 영어전공
류수아

류수아의 석사학위논문을 인준함

2014년 8월

위 원 장 _____

부위원장 _____

위 원 _____

Individual and System
in George Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*

APPROVED BY THESIS COMMITTEE:

MOONSU SHIN, COMMITTEE CHAIR

DOO-SUN RYU

BYOUNG CHUN MIN

ABSTRACT

Nineteen Eighty-Four, the last novel of George Orwell who has lived a life deeply involved with political situations of the time, exhibits the writer's profound hatred toward the ruling party and the class system. By showing how Winston, the protagonist, is cultivated as a resisting individual only to be exploited and pulverized according to the agenda of the Party, Orwell reveals the true nature and the working principle of the System; individual is needed only as an operating element. This is first explored in Orwell's another political novel, *Animal Farm*, by delineating how the System is formed. In the fable, we see how the good-intentioned revolutionary spirit eventually becomes corrupted through the days of political turnover and how the world stays the same with only the name of the ruler changed. All the individuals involved inside the System are exploited, removed of their individuality, and remained only as part of the collective being. While *Animal Farm* describes the phenomenal formation of the

System, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* exposes the underlying causes and aims of the System. More specifically, a textual analysis of the control devices that the Party uses for dehumanization and different features of each individual involved helps to conclude that the System deliberately raises dissidence in order to run itself. It suppresses and controls individuals so that they resist and fight back, because the resistance itself is one of the working principles of the System. It is already taken into account in the whole agenda. Individuals are exploited and subsumed inside the System only to be the working elements that are removed after the use. This is a very pessimistic warning that the Orwell gives to the world.

Keywords : resisting individual, operating elements, individuality, system, collective being, working principle, dehumanization, dissidence

Student Number : 2010 – 23564

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	i
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
CHAPTER 1. Introduction	1
CHAPTER 2. The Formation of the System in <i>Animal Farm</i>	16
CHAPTER 3. The Control Devices of the Party	31
CHAPTER 4. Individuals inside the System	46
CHAPTER 5. The Working Principle of the System	56
CHAPTER 6. Conclusion	74
WORKS CITED	79
ABSTRACT IN KOREAN	85

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

From birth, Eric Arthur Blair lived a life deeply involved with the political situation of the time. In 1903, he was born in British India to a father who worked for Indian Civil Service. At age four, he came to England with his family and started schooling at eight. As a young school boy, Blair showed distinctive talent in writing and was already determined to become a professional writer. However, he took his first job as a police officer in the Indian Imperial Police in Burma. About this unanticipated career, Raymond Williams, his biographer, explains as follows:

Blair's life until he was twenty-four is in all its visible details a training for membership in the administrative middle class of imperialist Britain. His family, on both sides, had lived and worked in India and Burma, in the army, administration, and trade.

His first adult work was directly within this pattern. (2)

Williams recognizes Blair's deep involvement with different political situations and how it has influenced his choice of the first job. Blair's experience of working as a police officer combined with his family background had a great impact on the way he saw the world and he was always aware of the political

force over people. More specifically, working for the Indian Imperial Police affected him to develop deep abhorrence toward Imperialism and the class system (Williams 7). After leaving the job, Blair lived in Paris for a short time and worked for a variety of working-class jobs such as a dishwasher and kitchen porter. Around this time, he became ill with pneumonia that would trouble him for the rest of his life.

When he returned to England, he started to establish himself as a writer by recording his experiences of living in Paris and Burma. He wrote two novels titled *Burmese Days* and *Down and Out in Paris and London*. When the first book was published, Blair adopted the penname, George Orwell. Having a new name signified the beginning of his career as a writer, but the books did not bring him an immediate success and instead forced him to do other kinds of work to make a living. Nonetheless, he kept writing and published more novels. Gradually, he started to gain reputation as a journalist mainly known for “his accounts of poverty and depression” (Williams 6). His plain, straightforward writing style fit the factual description required in journalism and therefore contributed to his little success as a journalist.

In 1937, Orwell went to Spain and this journey influenced him to a great extent; he joined the Spanish Civil War and witnessed how the ruling party deceived the public by fabricating lies and manipulating truths. Williams notes that Orwell became “a revolutionary socialist” (56) in Spain and “gave his

energy to warnings against a totalitarian socialist future” (61). Furthermore, Orwell’s life through the days of Stalinism and Nazism during the World Wars added to his political fear, and consequently, he produced a lot of writings to express his view and to give a warning against totalitarianism.

In his essay “Why I Write,” Orwell gives his idea of writing and its inseparable relation with politics by stating that “no book is genuinely free from political bias. The opinion that art should have nothing to do with politics is itself a political attitude” (26). His writing was, therefore, his own method of expressing his political ideas that had been influenced by his personal background and experiences. His attempts to intermingle politics with art were successfully manifested first into *Animal Farm*, and then *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Particularly through these two novels, Orwell expresses his disillusionment with the ruling party by revealing the true nature of a political system. While he exposes his profound anguish with the class system, he shows limits in that he is, at the same time, confined to the notion of the class system. In other words, he takes a self-contradictory attitude toward the working class. He admires their sincerity and diligence but despises their baseness and ignorance. This reveals his contemptuous affection and sympathy, and it is well-exposed in the two novels with which Orwell managed to establish himself as a prominent political writer.

When *Animal Farm* was published in 1945, the World War II came to an

end, but the world was going toward the Cold War. The novel's direct satire on Stalinism at the right timing had contributed to its success. However, it failed to attract much of academic interest. Its undue palpability bore not much room for critical interpretation or analysis and the fable style of the book also played a role in the lack of its critical reception.

On the other hand, when *Nineteen Eighty-Four* was published, it became an instant sensation and raised much of both public and critical attention. The timing, in fact, was perfect, for it was written in 1948 and published in 1949 during the Cold War when people were growing tense in the fear of totalitarianism after witnessing how Stalinism in Russia and Nazism in Germany had had attained success.¹ The book, with this demand of the time, was compelled to be taken as a prophetic warning for the future and an attack on a certain political ideology.

Fredric Warburg, the publisher of the book, has noted in his publisher's report that *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is "a deliberate and sadistic attack on socialism and socialist parties generally" (248) and advertised accordingly.² However, Orwell disputed this interpretation that takes the book only as an offensive political allegory targeted on British Socialism as follows:

¹ According to Michael Walzer, the totalitarian regimes in Russia and Germany should be considered to be success since they have been defeated only by outside force not from within. (108)

² Rodden, John. *The Politics of Literary Reputation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989. 25.

My recent novel [*Nineteen Eighty-Four*] is NOT intended as an attack on Socialism or on the British Labour party, (of which I am a supporter) but as a show-up of the perversions to which a centralised economy is liable and which have already been partly realized in Communism and Fascism. I do not believe that the kind of society I describe necessarily WILL arrive, but I believe...that something resembling it COULD arrive. I believe also that totalitarian ideas have taken root in the minds of intellectuals everywhere, and I have tried to draw these ideas out to their logical consequences. The scene of the book is laid in Britain in order to emphasize that the English-speaking races are not innately better than anyone else and that totalitarianism, if not fought against, could triumph anywhere.³ (564)

Orwell clarified that he had not intended an attack on British Socialism but rather a warning to people about the possibilities of totalitarian regimes in the world. He believed that “totalitarian ideas have taken root in the minds of intellectuals everywhere” and many critics agreed to accept the book as a warning to the world.

³ Orwell, George. Letter to Mr. Henson. 31 July 1949. *New York Times Book Review*. *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*. eds. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. Vol. 4. New York: Penguin Books, 1978. 564.

Philip Rahv notices a close link between Big Brother and Stalin and asserts that the book is “the best antidote to the totalitarian disease” (19) and “a timely momentous warning” (20).⁴ Golo Mann identifies the book as a “satirical novel about the future” and therefore a warning (277). Although he is certain that Orwell borrowed from Russia back then and from Fascism and Nazism, he contends that the book is not anti-Russian and that the theme is “the totalitarian danger that lies within ourselves and in all the political systems of our time” (281), recognizing the close relation the book has to the present. Erich Fromm, in his afterword for the book, pays attention to how Orwell endows his novel with distinction by building its relevance with the real life situation such as atomic war. He recognizes some elements of Stalinism in the book, but maintains that the book is a powerful warning rather than a description of Stalinist barbarism.

On the other hand, some critics such as James Walsh, Isaac Deutscher, and Irving Howe⁵ find a strong connection between the book and the real life but do not conclude if it is a warning. Walsh and Deutscher are in consonance with each other in that the book lacks originality and criticize Orwell for his insufficient political knowledge. Walsh maintains that the fact that Orwell borrowed much from preceding novels shows “certain inadequacies in his make-up” (214). In his

⁴ He has also stated that the book was “a diagnosis” rather than a “prognosis of things to come” (19).

⁵ They (Howe in “The Fiction of Anti-Utopia”) all argue for dystopian similarities shared among Orwell’s *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, Zamiatin’s *We* and Huxley’s *Brave New World*.

view, the book is a shallow interpretation of and depthless attack on the Communist Party; therefore, he considers the success of the book as inseparable from the political context of the Cold War. Deutscher contends that Orwell's satire is "recognizably aimed at Soviet Russia" (43) and British Labour Party, calling the book "a document of dark disillusionment not only with Stalinism but with every form and shade of socialism" (44). He also notes that the book works as "a sort of an ideological super-weapon in the cold war" (35), recognizing the social demand of the book in its contemporary political context. As opposed to these harsh critics, Howe shows his approval of the book by saying "no other book has succeeded so completely in rendering the essential quality of totalitarianism" ("History as Nightmare" 190). He finds a direct link between the book and Stalinism, but denies that it is prediction or projection of the future, maintaining that the book is an anti-utopian novel and "ought to be read as a mixture of genres, mostly Menippean satire and conventional novel" ("Enigmas of Power" 7).

The book, as a warning for the future and an attack on a political ideology of the present, aroused much fear in the public mind of Totalitarianism. People wondered if the world of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* would come true. To discuss the plausibility of the world sketched in the book, some critics examined the theory of totalitarianism. Quoting Hannah Arendt who said the leader of totalitarianism is believed to be "needed not as a person but as a function," Robert C. Tucker

claims that there is a “fundamental flaw in the theory of totalitarianism” (92). Since its essence lies in the requirement that the members of society must be in love with the leader, the regime perishes with him when he dies. Recognizing this tendency, he called totalitarianism “elusive phenomenon” (92) and Big Brother’s state “fantasy state” (102). About the “importance of personality ... in totalitarian politics” (114) that Tucker has pointed out, Walzer says Orwell solved the problem by having an immortal leader, Big Brother, in the novel. However, he refutes some factors that underpin the theoretical argument of the book, which he calls “novelty of totalitarian politics” (104), and contends that it is not a new kind of politics, but rather “the idealization of authoritarian rule” (116).

The “Orwell phenomenon”⁶ seemed to decrease after the 1950s, but revived around the year 1984 as it was the time the book had *foreseen*. To the comfort of many people worldwide, the world described in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* did not come into being, and this allowed diverse directions for critics.

Some critics held to the major line of criticism before the year 1984, but with their own different interpretation. For example, Malcolm R. Thorp maintains the same stance with previous critics in that the book is a political

⁶ Rodden termed the wide attention from cultural (commercial), political, literary circles that *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four* had brought to the author “Orwell phenomenon” (6) and “Orwell industry” (47).

satire and therefore a warning for the future. However, he differentiates his study with a detailed analysis of the text in which he shows the plausibility of the delineated totalitarian control.⁷ Stuart Hall agrees that the book is not an attack while recognizing the connection between Orwell's political view and real life situations such as Second World War and the Cold War. His study differs from preceding studies in that he called the book "a general historical tendency in modern states" (238) and related it to our modern life.

The variety of political interpretation of the book continued into the 2000s. Philip Goldstein argues that the book supports the neo-conservatism, saying "1984⁸ condemns the 'dictatorial' intellectuals, 'vacuous' academic formalism, 'mindless' popular culture, 'politically correct' feminists, Blacks, or radicals, and 'nihilistic' postmodern anti-aesthetics" (44). Calling the author "the prophet of false utopias" (73), Richard White examines how Orwell's works are influenced by the basic values of socialism. David Brin maintains that Orwell has prophesized totalitarianism in the book, which may have helped prevent the world of *Nineteen Eighty-Four* from coming into being, and believes that the author "focused also on the essential *stupidity* of tyranny" (224). Additionally, Bernard Crick who is a biographer and one of the major researchers of George

⁷ He wrote the book's success "lies in his creating a plausible description of how totalitarianism can destroy the individual and turn him into an automaton" (16).

⁸ The title should read *Nineteen Eighty-Four* as it was originally published, but it is too often rendered as year 1984.

Orwell complains that the book has been read without consideration of its time, which led “bad or partial readings.”⁹ He maintains that it is a plain satire, peculiarly a “Swiftian satire” (147) exemplified in Jonathan Swift’s *Gulliver’s Travels*,¹⁰ and includes detailed textual interpretation.

While the canon of studies from the time before the year 1984 to the present has attempted to formalize a general interpretation of the book, another line of studies have paid a special attention to the ending of the book. Most of critics have at one time or another tried to define the meaning and the nature of the last scene. About Winston Smith’s death in the end, they all ask this question: Was Orwell finally despairing? Since the book is the last work of Orwell, written a few months before his death, many critics relate the pessimism of the ending to the author’s ill health. Warburg and Deutscher conclude that Orwell’s despair from his poor health condition has caused the asperity of the book. Similarly, Isaac Rosenfeld contends that Winston “yields” (187) at the end from which he can’t “conceive of a greater despair” (188). Bertrand Russell defends Orwell, saying that he “was not by nature pessimistic or unduly obsessed by politics”

⁹ He exactly says: “It has been read as deterministic prophecy, as a kind of science fiction or a dystopia, as a conditional projection of the future, as a humanistic satire on contemporary events, as a total rejection of socialism of any kind, and as a libertarian socialist – almost an anarchist – protest against totalitarian tendencies and abuses of power both in his own and in other possible societies. Most bad or partial readings occur through not grasping the context of the time – the immediate postwar period” (146).

¹⁰ He argues that Orwell is “satirising the pretensions of hierarchy” (149).

(237), and finds the cause of the “utter despair” (237) of the book in the link between Orwell’s experience in Spanish Civil War and his aggravated health condition during the time of writing. On the contrary, Alaric Jacob who is one of Orwell’s schoolmates levels harsh criticism at the author, calling the book “a crude anti-communist polemic” (81). With his own memory of going to the same school with Orwell, Jacob disputes all the depressing elements in Orwell’s writing and at the same time criticizes him for his shallow understanding of politics. In addition, T. R. Fyvel, in his biographical eulogy of the author, tells that Orwell has admitted that “his ill-health was responsible for the shortcomings of the book[*Nineteen Eighty-Four*] and at least partly for its excessively pessimistic tone” (248). However, the argument that Orwell’s pessimism is the result of his aggravated health condition during the last years of his life has failed to gain consensus.

The idea for this paper has also arisen from the curiosity over the last scene about Winston’s death: why is he killed at the time of his complete submission? The Party has made much effort to *cure* him, but when it finally succeeds, it kills him off. Why does it need to do away with him when he has become what it had wanted him to be? It seems illogical and it is left to the readers to figure out what Orwell had intended behind the killing. Yet, previous studies have not paid much attention to ‘why’ of the killing. They have either defined the nature of the killing as pessimism or employed it in their general argument of the book.

To solve the posed question requires deep consideration into the relationship between the two – Winston as a resisting individual and the Party that restrains him. When it comes to the issue of individual, however, Winston has not received much of critical attention. Darius Rejali talks about Winston but his focus is mainly on the torture Winston goes through and the issue of modern torture in Orwell's term. Frank H. Thompson covers Winston as the sole subject of his study, but he only emphasizes Winston as "the man of good will" (235) and concentrates his critical focus on Winston's disability to make his resistance on theoretical grounds.

On the relation between the Party and Winston, there are two studies that hold some relevant significance to this paper. Philip G. Zimbardo provides a careful examination of the human nature portrayed in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* by analyzing the Party's mind control technologies, but he does not delve further into the relationship. As a psychologist, he rather utilizes his analysis of the book in his exposition of a social psychological experiment. In contrast, Daphne Patai talks about the Party and an individual in her study, but she explores it in the framework of the game theory. Interestingly, the track of her interpretation is in line with my own explanation of the relation between the Party and the individual. However, her focus is on the 'game' played between the two individual men, Winston and O'Brien, not on the relation between the Party and the individual. Besides, the goal of her analysis is to argue for Orwell's

androcentric attitude in the novel by noticing how Julia, a female main character, is missed out in the male-centered game. Although these studies deal with Winston to some degree, studies that examine him as a resisting individual and how he stands against the Party are not sufficient.

Therefore, this paper aims to investigate Winston as a resisting individual and how the Party works against him. By unraveling the mystery of his death at the end of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, I will investigate the true nature and the working principle of the System¹¹ and show how individuals are exploited and subsumed inside. The primary goal, therefore, is to come to a conclusion regarding the relationship between the individual and the System that Orwell wanted to report and accuse through his last novel. From the fact that Winston is killed at the moment of his complete submission to the Party, it becomes evident that an individual is needed only as an operating element inside the System. This will be examined and proved through the following chapters. In the next chapter, Orwell's another most acclaimed political novel, *Animal Farm*, will be studied in order to study the formation of the System. The story shows the process in which a problematic (and thus politically repressive) system is shaped out of individuals' originally good will. This process of a system's formation will reveal how individuality and collectivity are ironically intertwined with each other in

¹¹ The word 'System' (with capitalized S) will be used hereupon as the prototype of a system as a repressive mechanism generally represented by the Party.

the operation of a system. From Chapter Three to Five, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* will be closely investigated to study the working principle of the System. Chapter Three examines the mind control devices that the Party utilizes to dehumanize people in Oceania. Through the precise analysis of major tools of the dehumanization process, we will be able to better understand how the System exploits individual humans and subsumes their individuality. Chapter Four studies the result of the dehumanization process by taking a close look at major individual characters and the Proles. Examining each individual and the Proles will allow us to learn Orwell's complex attitude toward the elite group and the working class in the society, and his ultimate message to each group. Then, Chapter Five will demystify the working principle of the System by elucidating with contextual support how a resisting individual is deliberately cultivated, dehumanized, and finally pulverized as a working agent in the operation of the System. It reveals that individuality is a crucial element of collectivity; the ruling party that builds and runs the System is a group of individuals who have lost their individuality, and the System is operated only by depriving resisting individuals of their individuality. In the last chapter, conclusion will be provided along with the implications for this Information Age we are living in. In brief, this paper argues that the System sustains its power by cultivating a resisting individual and then pulverizing his/her individuality. More importantly, the operating elements of the ruling party of the System are individuals without

individuality. This reveals the true horror of the System and therefore a very pessimistic warning.

CHAPTER II

The Formation of the System in *Animal Farm*

While *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is a story of the working principle of the System, Orwell's another political novel, *Animal Farm*, tells a story of the formation of the System. As it is the first book into which Orwell has manifested his hope of combining politics and art,¹² the book contains much of his suspicions and disbeliefs that he has been having about the political situations of the time. Studying this novel will allow us a deeper understanding of the System that this paper aims to explain. Morris Dickstein called *Animal Farm* "[*Nineteen Eighty-Four*'s] light-handed predecessor" and pointed out that while "it brilliantly mocks many features of the Soviet system" it "makes little show of explaining how or why they came about" (135). I argue that *Animal Farm* is a story of the process of the System being built and its 'why' is explained in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. It tells how a rebellion is incited in the repressed society under a certain political system by a group of well-intentioned individuals and how the good intentions in the beginning eventually become corrupted. During the political turnover, the life stays the same for the public, especially for the

¹² He says: "*Animal Farm* was the first book in which I tried, with full consciousness of what I was doing, to fuse political purpose and artistic purpose into one whole" ("Why I Write" 29)

working class. They constantly suffer from excessive labor and unfair treatment that paint gloom of their life. More specifically, this book shows how the System maintains its collective being by exploiting and pulverizing the individuals inside. Therefore, exploring how *Animal Farm* allegorizes the formation of the System and studying what significant implication this allegory suggests will help better apprehend the essence of the working principle of the System portrayed in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*.

Orwell's personal experience of Spanish Civil War made him belligerent to Stalin and the Soviet Union. In Orwell's eyes, the Soviet Union had built a dictatorship through a horrible reign of terror. In the book, he incorporated his deep hatred against Stalinism into a fable of farm animals. It is a political allegory deliberately written to satirize Russian Communism and its distortion by Stalin, a power-hungry individual. Through this allegory, Orwell shows how well-intentioned idealism becomes "decayed by steps into inequality, hierarchy and finally dictatorship," and how individuality is subsumed into collectivity of a system (Dickstein 135).

The initial idealism for the revolution is provided by the venerated old Major, the Middle White boar, as the story begins with his speech that instigates other animals to raise a rebellion against the humans for a better life. He represents Karl Marx in that he awakens animals by eloquently picturing the darkness of the present state at the farm and inspires them to hope for the bright

future that will come. Like Karl Marx, old Major dies before he sees the world he has predicted comes to pass. After his death, his idealism gradually becomes wrongfully exploited and distorted at the end by a power-hungry boar, Napoleon, who represents Stalin. As Napoleon builds his own nation with his group of pigs, he mingles with humans and starts to lose his own identity as a pig. The ruling group of pigs becomes indistinguishable from humans in the last scene of the book. This signifies that their individuality is removed and that they are all subsumed into the collective identity of a ruling group of the System.

Through his speech, the old Major leaves great legacy for animals, the theoretical background for Animalism and the anthem to sing, *Beasts of England*.

“Major’s speech had given to the more intelligent animals on the farm a completely new outlook on life. They did not know when the Rebellion predicted by Major would take place, they had no reason for thinking that it would be within their own lifetime, but they saw clearly that it was their duty to prepare for it” (15).

Pigs, as they are “generally recognized as being the cleverest of the animals,” take the responsibility of teaching and organizing animals for the prospective rebellion (15). Among them, Snowball and Napoleon emerge as most notable visionary revolutionists along with the sweet talker, Squealer. These three pigs develop Major’s teachings into a comprehensive system of thought that they call Animalism.

They hold secret meetings to awaken other animals by teaching them the principles of Animalism in order to eventually instigate a rebellion. These pigs are true visionaries, at this time, who dream of the new world by bringing a change to the current system. However, reforming the animals is not easy because most of them pay no attention and care little about changing the world; they simply do not seem to understand the true meaning of ‘revolution.’ It seems that they have no problem as long as they are fed.

At the beginning [pigs] met with much stupidity and apathy.

Some of the animals talked of the duty of loyalty to Mr. Jones, whom they referred to as “Master,” or made elementary remarks such as “Mr. Jones feeds us. If he were gone, we should starve to death.” Others asked such questions as “Why should we care what happens after we are dead?” or “If this Rebellion is to happen anyway, what difference does it make whether we work for it or not?” and the pigs had great difficulty in making them see that this was contrary to the spirit of Animalism.” (16-17)

It points to the ludicrousness of the animal public that, while they are easily excited with the song, *Beasts of England*, they do not care much when they have to learn about what they are singing for. Their “stupidity” regarding “the duty of loyalty” denotes how they are accustomed to their state as slaves, and their “apathy” to anything unrelated to their everyday living plainly conveys the

ignorance of the general public. This dismissal of the public as a short-sighted, ignorant crowd is consistent through the world of *Animal Farm* and *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Predictably, it is not the principle of Animalism that triggers the animal public to raise a rebellion. The hunger sets them off; the rebellion has been a mere reaction to one of the unsatisfied basic needs. When the hungry animals go wild and the farm falls in huge uproar, the revolution takes place by accident and animals take possession of the farm. Orwell seems to believe in this kind of power that resides in Proles – the power to bring about a revolution. However, as can be seen in the hunger-triggered rebellion in the Manor Farm, he portrays the public as ignorant group of individuals that only take action for their basic drives, not for their belief.

In the next morning when the animals rejoice over the farm that now belongs to them, pigs present themselves as a ruling group and replace the empty position of the owner by boasting their intelligence. Right after the revolution, when the bright new future is supposed to come as the old Major has predicted, pigs, the intelligentsia, already start to show signs of corrupting the original visions with which they have started in the beginning. Pigs have acquired skills to read and write by learning from old books that originally belonged to Mr. Jones's son. It is absurd that the pigs have sprung just in time to claim the leadership when the rebellion has not occurred under their planned scheme but only due to the cows' outpouring of anger caused by their hunger. It is even more

absurd that the pigs know how to read and write by learning from a human's book, and promote Animalism at the same time. It is against their spirit of Animalism to deal with anything that pertains to humans. Somehow, what the pigs do with human remnants is condoned; animals feel some obscure suspicion but no one knows how to pin down what is wrong due to their lack of intelligence.

Moreover, pigs do not work but only assign various jobs and supervise others' work; "With their superior knowledge it was natural that they should assume the leadership" (27) and "the leadership" means no labor just as Mr. Jones has not done any work. They are already becoming humans. Old Major has once blamed humans for "consum[ing] without producing" (7) and likewise, pigs are eating without working. Furthermore, they take some valuable products such as milk and apples exclusively only for themselves. Their excuse is that they must keep good health for the animals' sake, not for their own sake, because they are the "brainworkers" (36) of the farm. Here, Orwell derides the elite group in the society. They use their intelligence to work but no practical production occurs. They only consume the fruits of the working class labor. Orwell is reprimanding their greedy selfishness that they want to take only the good things without doing any physical work. It is true that pigs use their brains to work, but it is unclear if their brainwork does any good for the animals as a whole group, since the public life has not improved any better. When some animals confront

them with complaints, the pigs always give the argument that what they do is only to prevent Mr. Jones from coming back. Since the last thing animals want is to have their original human owner back, this argument is never reputed against. Besides, no other animals are capable of arguing with reason.

Without much hardship, pigs take steps to build their own system for the new age. They change the name of the farm to Animal Farm and announce the Seven Commandments¹³ for all animals to follow. In every meeting, Snowball comes up with various plans to work on the Animal Farm for the sake of the public. However, his good intentions soon become useless and the animal world falls apart when Napoleon's covetous greed for power institutes a reign of terror. When Snowball gains the majority's favor, he is abruptly attacked by some fierce dogs that have broken covert. It turns out that the dogs have been secretly reared and trained by Napoleon as his own henchmen. Snowball, chased by the blood-thirsty dogs, escapes barely and goes ousted from the farm. It is a prelude to Napoleon's reign of terror. Now, without Snowball, he succeeds in becoming an

¹³ The initial Seven Commandments run as follows:

1. Whatever goes upon two legs is an enemy.
2. Whatever goes upon four legs, or has wings, is a friend.
3. No animal shall wear clothes.
4. No animal shall sleep in a bed.
5. No animal shall drink alcohol.
6. No animal shall kill any other animal.
7. All animals are equal.

omnipotent ruler of undefeatable authority guarded by his ferocious personal pets. On the other hand, Snowball, who represents Trotsky, falls to a state of despicable criminal that has reportedly planned unmentionable treachery. This is a compelling satire that shows how the well-intentioned visions can be ruined and distorted by a power-hungry individual and his use of terror as the means.

To secure his power, Napoleon runs a system that is similar to that of the Party in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. He uses the methods of Stalinism: Squealer works as a propagandist who controls the public opinion with his sweet tongue; the dogs foment unrest and fear; and brutal purges and merciless slaughters of *traitors* take place. Squealer, with his eloquent talent to “turn black into white” and his persuasive whisking of his tail (16), transforms all the creative work that Snowball has done into Napoleon’s contribution while fabricating Snowball as a sordid swindler. For example, Squealer tells other animals how Snowball has stolen all the good ideas for the farm from Napoleon and how Snowball’s contribution in the Battle of Cowshed has been exaggerated when he has actually worked as a spy and traitor who secretly fought for Mr. Jones and his men.

Through Squealer’s sweet talk, the past is rendered harsh and intolerable and the present much improved and enriched, supposedly due to all the hard work and enormous contribution of Napoleon. The truths are manipulated and lies are fabricated to make him the only one trustworthy leader. When met with objections, Squealer skillfully turns the focus of arguments and puts an end to

disputes by saying “Surely, comrades, you do not want Jones back?” (56).

Dickstein noted that “this reliance on deceit is accompanied by reminders that though life under the new system may be hard, though some of the promises of the Revolution may remain unfulfilled, things remain better than they were under Jones” (142). Along with these “reminders” eloquently laid by Squealer, a group of sheep helps quieting down any uneasiness that might circulate among the animal public. When they cry in a shriek “Four legs good, two legs bad!,” any “momentary awkwardness was smoothed over” (63) and the animals soon forget their distress and focus on what is going on at the moment.

The manipulation of the past and the truth is accompanied by frequent amendments of the Seven Commandments of Animalism. One of the most terrifying examples is the amendment of Sixth Commandment which originally runs: “No animal shall kill any other animal.” After the purges and slaughters of supposed traitors, it has two more words added to the end of the sentence: *without cause* (91). The purges, then, are rationalized, because animals come out for voluntary confessions to their treacherous crimes and it gives a reasonable *cause* for Napoleon to slaughter them with his fierce dogs. On an evening when Napoleon gathers everyone in the yard, his dogs drag four pigs and the show trial starts. Many animals come out and confess their crimes mostly related to secret alliance with Snowball. Right after their confessions, they are all executed by the dogs.

And so the tale of confession and executions went on, until there was a pile of corpses lying before Napoleon's feet and heavy with the smell of blood, which had been unknown there since the expulsion of Jones These scenes of terror and slaughter were not what they had looked forward to on that night when old Major first stirred them to rebellion. (84)

Through the description of such an appalling moment, Orwell is highlighting the corruption of the Animal Farm, rather than the horror itself. What this insightfully reveals is the process in which an idealistic vision turns into repressive political apparatuses through an implementation of physical powers. This issue indeed is delved into especially when Clover the mare shows her awareness of the disjunction between their old ideals and the reality.

If she herself had had any picture of the future, it had been of a society of animals set free from hunger and the whip, all equal, each working according to his capacity, the strong protecting the weak. (86-87)

The old ideals of the old Major are reawakened, but she fails to understand why their ideals have fallen.

Instead – she did not know why – they had come to a time when no one dared speak his mind, when fierce, growling dogs roamed everywhere, and when you had to watch your comrades torn to

pieces after confessing to shocking crimes. (87)

Clover does not understand why they are living in such a world where all the animals are caught frozen in fear with no freedom of speech. She does not understand why there have to be confessions and slaughters.

There was no thought of rebellion or disobedience in her mind.

She knew that, even as things were, they were far better off than they had been in the days of Jones But still, it was not for this that she and all the other animals had hoped and toiled Such were her thoughts, though she lacked the words to express them.

(87)

Due to the lack of intelligence, Clover cannot understand why there is a huge gap between their ideal dreams for the future and the reality they are living now.

Because she does not understand, she remains faithful despite her confusion. The world has turned into a nightmare. The promising world they all have dreamt is nowhere to be seen. Rather, the life is tougher, harsher, and hungrier, although animals work even harder.

Among the animal public, the most representative example of the working class is Boxer the horse. Regardless of the changes in the ruling party of the farm, he works with an enduring sense of duty:

He had been a hard worker even in Jones's time, but now he seemed more like three horses than one; there were days when the

entire work of the farm seemed to rest on his mighty shoulders.

(29)

He stands for the diligence, patience and arduous patriotism filled with loyalty. These are the virtues that make Orwell admire the working class. Dickstein argues that, “with Boxer as the tireless engine of industrial growth,” Orwell “pays tribute to the achievements of the Russian working class even under conditions of totalitarian domination and horrendous errors of leadership” (143). Boxer’s diligence and determination to work hard in any circumstances are truly admirable, but at the same time, he represents the blind faith that the working class holds toward its ruler. He firmly believes in Napoleon and never questions what his ruler does. His personal mottos are “Napoleon is always right” and “I will work harder” (56). Even in adverse circumstances under Napoleon’s reign of terror, Boxer blames himself and other animals for what happens due to the lack of intelligence. He never doubts that Napoleon could be wrong and that he could be mistreated. In his blind obedience to Napoleon, Boxer simply thinks working harder would solve all problems:

I do not understand it. I would not have believed that such things could happen on our farm. It must be due to some fault in ourselves. The solution, as I see it, is to work harder. From now onwards I shall get up a full hour earlier in the mornings. (85)

However, his attempt to improve the situations by working harder does not serve

the purpose. It only aggravates his health and he eventually collapses. He has served his farm with a great sense of duty and loyalty toward the ruling party, but his labor is requited with evil. He has been exploited for life and is discarded as soon as he becomes useless. On the contrary to Squealer's announcement that Boxer has received a proper treatment from a veterinarian, Boxer meets the most tragic death supposedly without any kind of care. When the animals all believe that Boxer is being taken to a veterinarian, the van that carries him is seen with the sign, "Horse Slaughterer and Glue Boiler," painted on the side (122). To calm down the animals, Squealer and Napoleon deliver a blatant lie that they have done everything they could do to save Boxer but they have failed. Pathetically, the animals are "enormously relieved to hear" the lies (125) and it is implied that pigs have bought another bottle of whisky with the money they have earned from selling Boxer. The tragedy of Boxer shows how the ruling party only exploits the working class in order to fulfill their greed through deliberate manipulation of truth and blatant deceits, and such exploitations are an inevitable part of the system in the Animal Farm.

When Napoleon gains strong conviction about his power and authority in the farm, he announces that the revolution is complete and abolishes the anthem, *Beasts of England*, which is one of the tools that have been used to incite the public to rebel. Moreover, he changes the name of the farm back to its original name, Manor Farm. With the old name restored and the revolution anthem

abolished, it is obvious that the farm has now returned to the old system.

Including the Seven Commandments, Napoleon also removes many things that are remained from the days of rebellion. Furthermore, the ruling pigs adopt many features of human; they have learned to walk on their two hind legs, drink alcohol, and slept in beds in Jones' house. Napoleon now walks on two feet with "a whip in his trotter" (133); he is no longer a 'pig.' He now runs the farm as a normal human owner as Mr. Jones used to run, only even better. He has successfully replaced the position of the original owner of the farm by being the human owner himself. The last paragraph of the book suggests that his transformation into the original human owner is complete:

Twelve voices were shouting in anger, and they were all alike. No question, now, what had happened to the faces of the pigs. The creatures outside looked from pig to man, and from man to pig, and from pig to man again; but already it was impossible to say which was which. (141)

As the pigs become a collective being as the ruling party, they lose their own identity, their unique individuality. It is, in fact, truly debasing. They are falling away from the animal world without their unique features that make them animal; they no longer hold their own value with which they can be themselves. All the while, nothing has much changed for the general animal public; only the name of their owner has changed. Napoleon has replaced Mr. Jones, who is Big

Brother in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, and lost all the qualities that make him a pig. Once individuals become the ruling party as a group, their individuality is annihilated. The good-intentioned individuals, be they visionary leaders or hard-working laborers, are exploited and lose their individuality once they are subsumed into one collective being. The allegory of *Animal Farm* shows not only how individuality works as an important agent of collectivity but also how individuality loses its own essence when it is integrated into a collective system.

Chapter III

The Control Devices of the Party

As observed in the previous chapter, *Animal Farm* depicts the formation of the System, but it is a mere explanation of the phenomenon without the detailed analysis of underlying causes. The following novel, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, goes deeper into the nature and the principles of the ruling party in order to reveal the ultimate aim of the System. This is done by the protagonist, Winston Smith, who as an insider of the Party is deeply involved in the works of the System, but unable to grasp the ultimate ‘why.’ He questions the rational grounds of the Party doctrines and falls in confusion. All the mysteries, however, are disentangled when he meets O’Brien in the Ministry of Love. In *the Book*, O’Brien explains the history and ecology of the Party in detail and provides the background information that answers Winston’s all-time question.

O’Brien says that the Party “seeks power entirely for its own sake” (263). He reveals that the sole purpose of the Party is to obtain and sustain the absolute power. According to his explanation in *the Book*, history is a continuous turn-over between the Middle and the High with the Low always in their servitude; it is a “cyclical process” (202) in which the Middle bring down the High and become the High till overthrown by the next Middle. The High always try to

keep the power inside their small privileged circle while the Middle always try to wrest authority from the High for their own sake. In case of the Low, they assist the Middle in the process of the political turnover, while clinging to the values of social equality that the Middle reportedly work for; however, in the end, on their part, “no historic change has ever meant much more than a change in the name of their masters” (202).

With this historical knowledge of the perpetual political overturns, the High, then, have to preclude the smallest possibility of an uprising if they are to retain their status as long as they want. Once the Middle have become the High through revolution, they needed a political system that ensures their power. In case of the High of Oceania, the Party, O’Brien says “one makes the revolution in order to establish the dictatorship” (263). But the choice is not simply a regular dictatorship but of Totalitarianism. It aims to establish total control over all aspects of life. Then, the Party knows that its fate rests on mind control, because it is the human consciousness that triggers an outbreak of revolution; the human faculty of judgment evokes the awareness of one’s own social condition and place in politics, which then instigate the psychological demand for a change. Therefore, “to extinguish once and for all the possibility of independent thought,” (193) the Party comes up with a totalitarian political system called Ingsoc. With Big Brother as its undying dictator, the Party attempts to realize its own idea of a society where no single thought of an individual could wander

around. To achieve the absolute power that spares no room for revolution, the Party makes use of a variety of devices for mind control, and the examination of the devices is essential in understanding of the working principle of the System.

As the first step of the mind control, the Party develops a new language system for the reality control to preclude free thinking in any case. In Orwell's view, language shapes thought to a great extent, and he is particularly concerned with the interrelation between language and thought. In his essay "Politics and the English Language," where he reprehends mindless, abstract use of hackneyed images and phrases, he states: "[English language] becomes ugly and inaccurate because our thoughts are foolish, but the slovenliness of our language makes it easier for us to have foolish thoughts" (157). Furthermore, he warns that "[ready-made phrases] will construct your sentences for you – even think your thoughts for you, to a certain extent from yourself" (165). This, he says, is when "the special connection between politics and the debasement of language becomes clear" (165). With the notion that language can affect thought, it is a matter of course for the Party to modify the language in order to control thought.

Therefore, Newspeak, the distinctive official language of Oceania, comes into play as one of the most indispensable principles of Ingsoc, the system of thought that rules over the world in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. Born out of Standard English, or Oldspeak, "by eliminating undesirable words and by stripping such words as remained of unorthodox meanings" (300), Newspeak "provide[s] a

medium of expression for the world-view and mental habits proper to the devotees of Ingsoc” (299). Although it is not yet complete, it is a new language that is designed to fulfill “the ideological needs of Ingsoc” (299), the purpose of which is “to narrow the range of thought” (52). Orthodoxy in the Oceanian society means having an unquestioning belief in the principles of Ingsoc, and deifying Big Brother (55). The Party’s aim is not only to have the public believe in its doctrine, but to have the belief penetrate into the public mind, so that orthodoxy would be “unconsciousness” (53). Newspeak, then, helps build a *proper* sense of orthodoxy in people’s mind by incapacitating them for proper thinking. They are confined within the strict limits of language, and as a result end up with a blind faith in the indoctrinated principles of Ingsoc. In addition, to ensure this with more certainty, Thought Police comes into action and keeps its eye on people to detect Thoughtcrime. Any unorthodox thoughts, which mean any thoughts against the Party and its doctrine, are discovered and punished.

The government system that the Party has built is of a new kind where it holds the absolute power – the totalitarian state.¹⁴ An illusion that the Party is “infallible” and Big Brother “omnipotent” should be contrived and made fact in order to maintain this system (212). Only for this kind of absolute power and

¹⁴ Although its originality is arguable, Arendt states “totalitarianism differs essentially from other forms of political oppression known to us, such as despotism, tyranny and dictatorship. Wherever it rose to power, it developed entirely new political institutions and destroyed all social, legal and political traditions of the country” (256).

authority, can individuality be deserted; in *the Book*, it notes “Oceanic society rests ultimately on the belief that Big Brother is omnipotent and that the Party is infallible” (212). However, “since in reality Big Brother is not omnipotent and the Party is not infallible, there is need for an unwearying, moment-to-moment flexibility in the treatment of facts” (212). To manipulate the facts, the present realities, the Party has to start with the past if it wants to make changes in the present, because the past leads to constitution of the present and exerts immense influence on the present consciousness. The present cannot be conceived without the past; past events shape up and color the present realities. Such knowledge of the past empowers our ability to place ourselves in the vast stream of history, and thus to find our origin with which we grow our sense of self and personality. Therefore, to ensure complete compliance with the doctrine of Ingsoc, the Party then keeps deleting, rewriting, modifying, and sometimes creating the records so that the past would be consistent with the current situations that it has fabricated. When necessary, it even creates and kills a hypothetical person.¹⁵ This case reveals the extent to which the reality control is carried out.

Amidst these continuous changes of the past that “survive[s] only in written records and in human memories” (213), conflicts arise between the revised facts

¹⁵ On the creation of Comrade Ogilvy, it says in the book: “Comrade Ogilvy, who had never existed in the present, now existed in the past, and when once the act of forgery was forgotten, he would exist just as authentically, and upon the same evidence, as Charlemagne or Julius Caesar” (47).

of written records and memories in human mind. 'Fact' is no longer true and truth no longer holds objectivity; the *reality* is the false truth that has been made true. It is no longer a matter of either objectivity or subjectivity; there exists only the *reality* concocted in the hands of the Party. Through the discrepancy between the external *reality* conceived and the stored knowledge retained, people come to reside on the blurred line between lies and truths with no reliable source to refer to and, as a result, start to forget the sense of self; human memory is shaken and individual judgment loses its credibility. When individuals fall in confusion due to their incapability of autonomous perception and self-directing decision, Doublethink is presented as the faculty for them to deceive their own perception and still be fine. It is "a vast system of mental cheating" (215) that enables people to accept two contradictory convictions simultaneously; in *the Book*, it explains:

To tell deliberate lies while genuinely believing in them, to forget any fact that has become inconvenient, and then, when it becomes necessary again, to draw it back from oblivion for just so long as it is needed, to deny the existence of objective reality and all the while to take account of the reality which one denies – all this is indispensably necessary. (214)

As there is no reality that could be objectively proved in concurrence with what is veritably happening and observed, it is important for people in Oceania to

fully adopt Doublethink in order not to fall in disconcertment. Doublethink also allows other crucial tactics such as Crimestop and Blackwhite to be put into operation inside one's mind. With the Crimestop, which is "the faculty of stopping short, as though by instinct, at the threshold of any dangerous thought," (212) individuals automatically ignore the cognitive demand to investigate further when dubiety arises, so as to follow the Party's "final, most essential command" which is to "reject the evidence of [one's] eyes and ears" (81). Blackwhite is an explicit form of example for Doublethink. *The Book* defines it as follows:

Applied to an opponent, it means the habit of impudently claiming that black is white, in contradiction of the plain facts.

Applied to a Party member, it means a loyal willingness to say that black is white when Party discipline demands this.

But it means also the ability to *believe* that black is white, and more, to *know* that black is white, and to forget that one has ever believed the contrary. (212)

With this deliberate mental cheating, individuals can properly live in the world of subjective reality that frequently changes according to the agenda of the Party.

In addition to these devices that control the human mind, physiological control takes place in order to incite psychological reactions. With no physiological satisfaction, no emotional safety, and no personal space for

individuality, basic human needs are never fully fulfilled; “all pleasure from the sexual act” (65) is prohibited, the state of hunger is in its steady stream, and everyone is always sleep-deprived. Repression of satisfaction by keeping the state of constant deficiency gives the Party a better chance of controlling people, because such lack works as a driving force for them to get excited at the doctrine of the Party and participate in the related activities.

In case of sexual pleasure, its lack “induced hysteria, which was desirable because it could be transformed into war fever and leader worship” (133). Thus, all kinds of act that could bring sexual pleasure are banned. Even in marriage, couples are forced to be separated if they confess being physically attracted toward each other. They should feel no interest in each other so that they wouldn’t be able to gain any kind of pleasure during the sexual intercourse. This is because the “only recognized purpose of marriage” is “to beget children for the service of the Party” (65). Furthermore, even an organization like Junior Anti-Sex League which “advocated complete celibacy for both sexes” (65) is in operation, because the ultimate goal of the Party is to have children through “artificial insemination” (66) and raise them in public institutions. On the other hand, the Party tends to “encourage prostitution, as an outlet for instincts which could not be altogether suppressed” (65), because it is well aware of how strong the sex instinct could be. In fact, it tries to “distort” or “dirty” the sex instinct if it cannot completely kill it (66).

For other basic needs, the story goes the same; food ration is always given out never to the level of satisfaction and daily supplies such as razor blades, buttons, and shoelaces are always scarce. One's stomach is never full and nothing is ever fully equipped. Moreover, people are deprived of sleep most of time. They are demanded to wake up at the same time every morning, but the time they can go to bed varies according to their work schedule which depends on the agenda of the Party. They usually overwork and are given little time for rest.

Along with the physiological lack of satisfaction, the Party ensures no sense of safety for emotional control. It is similar to Napoleon's purges in *Animal Farm*, but of a more ingenious kind. It deliberately foments anxiety and keeps people in fear and hatred by carrying out public trials, Hate Week, and a continuous war against Goldstein and an ever-changing enemy. Holding public trials serves a couple of functions; it is a warning to potential rebels, a stimulant for people to be filled with irrational craze, and a source of entertainment. The public trials convict criminals of all kinds of treachery that are unprovable; although confessions are made by the criminals themselves, most of the felonies they admit sound implausible. Such dubiety is easily overlooked, because no one ever questions the veracity of the case. Even if it is questioned, it can be neither proved nor disproved, since related records have already been fabricated.

However fallacious the case is, it is a showcase of the Party's power and authority by which potential rebels should be warned and unconsciously

threatened. Seeing how their acquaintances are interrogated and accused in front of the public and witnessing how the accused are vaporized and removed from the records of all kinds, anyone with the slightest chance of turning into a rebel would be persuaded to abandon their disobedient ideas. To the general public, it is a tool to keep them in madness and a source of entertainment for their lost humanity. In the beginning of the book, the Parsons children who are overexcited for “the hanging” are extremely disappointed because they cannot go to see it (23). The dying of people is only a show that people enjoy; one even utters “It was a good hanging” (49). As crowds are caught in irrational craze and indifferent to the agony of the accused in affliction, they always gather around the ‘show’ to have some fun and discharge their energy. It is quite different from how spectators in *Animal Farm* felt uneasy and even scared at the public trials. The Inner Party members’ inability to sympathize with victims reveals how dehumanized they are.

Hate Week and the subsequent creation of enemies remove any kind of positive feelings except the love for Big Brother, and make people full of fear and hatred. Hate Week is a week-long festival of Two Minutes Hate, a daily ritual where people watch a film depicting the Party’s enemies and fervently express their hostility. The enemy on the screen is either Emmanuel Goldstein or one of the super-states with which the Party claims to be in war. During the Hate, people are involuntarily thrown into frenzy but soon made to actively participate

in it. Orwell writes:

A hideous ecstasy of fear and vindictiveness, a desire to kill, to torture, to smash faces in with a sledge hammer, seemed to flow through the whole group of people like an electric current, turning one even against one's will into a grimacing, screaming lunatic. And yet the rage that one felt was an abstract, undirected emotion which could be switched from one object to another like the flame of a blowlamp. (14)

The enemies are, however, very dubious in nature. Goldstein is told to be "one of the leading figures of the Party, almost on a level with Big Brother," but he "had engaged in counterrevolutionary activities, had been condemned to death, and had mysteriously escaped and disappeared" (12). He is always the central figure in the various programs of the Two Minutes Hate: "He was the primal traitor, the earliest defiler of the Party's purity. All subsequent crimes against the Party, all treacheries, acts of sabotage, heresies, deviations, sprang directly out of his teaching" (12). The description is somewhat incomplete and unclear; it sounds ambiguous that he "had mysteriously escaped and disappeared" but is responsible for all the unorthodox crimes against the Party. Moreover, he is compared to a sheep, a conventional symbol of sacrifice: he looks like a sheep with the voice of a "sheeplike quality" (12) on the screen. The analogy between a symbol of sacrifice and Goldstein implies that he may not truly exist but is only a

fabricated target created for public enmity. After all, the Hate incites hysterical furor over enemies and it works as an energy outlet for people to release their suppressed emotions such as anger and hatred by redirecting them away from the Party to external targets. It is an efficient tool to minimize recalcitrant thoughts and behaviors.

In addition, social isolation and seclusion are enforced to make it impossible for people to achieve emotional safety and security in relationships. Knowing that Thought Police is undercover somewhere along with the telescreen everywhere, people cannot have any kind of freedom such as of speech and action. Naturally, these circumstances interfere with their relationships. It is unthinkable to have a sincere conversation with others to build a deep, meaningful bond in a relationship, because any unnecessary contacts are forbidden. Spy Network is the agency that heightens this social isolation so that no trust can be built among individuals; even your own children can be spies and turn you down. Similarly, seclusion is enforced; everyone is forced to live in complete aloneness apart from each other. If there is no child, separation is encouraged for a married couple; when living with a family, each member leads a separate life aloof from other members of the family.

Ironically, while seclusion is forced, desired solitude is forbidden; individualism and eccentricity called 'ownlife' in Newspeak is never granted with the telescreen and hidden microphones everywhere. Even in one's own

small space, “to do anything that suggested a taste for solitude ... was always slightly dangerous” (82), because it would be watched, detected, and condemned. It is a paradox of forced life in Oceania that individuals are kept secluded without a social company, but not allowed to seek or enjoy solitude. Malcolm Muggeridge notes that “the paradox of totalitarianism is that it intensifies personal solitude when it forces all the isolated figures into one overpowering system” (153). It is an ironical, impossible demand, and it implies the ambiguous nature of the System. This irony can be explored further in conformity that the Party foregrounds in its doctrine. For example, ‘facecrime,’ an eccentric behavior or talk, or even an unusual facial expression, is punished.

The smallest thing could give you away. A nervous tic, an unconscious look of anxiety, a habit of muttering to yourself – anything that carried with it the suggestion of abnormality, of having something to hide. In any case, to wear an improper expression on your face (to look incredulous when a victory was announced, for example) was itself a punishable offense. (62)

Here, the meaning of “abnormality” or “improper” needs to be discussed in more detail. Anything that deviates from what is expected is defined *abnormal* or *improper*, and subject to accusation by Thought Police. It means that all the facial, behavioral, emotional reactions should occur only according to the intention of the Party. In Oceania, conformity is one of the most essential

constituents for life. Everyone must be the same; all aspects of life are regulated in accordance with the Party doctrine. In other words, it is a world governed by the rule of normality. Under the rule of normality, individual peculiarity is removed; they have to be alike to each other in terms of thought, behavior, and expression. They are never allowed to be different. As Mark Crispin Miller observes, the goal is to “make no difference” (28) under this “monolithic system” (30). What is absurd is that, in many cases, “there was no definite rule” (87). Even though there are no concrete, explicit rules that are stated, *unusual* actions are detected and punished. However absurd this may seem, it is an effective strategy to take care of counterarguments, because a code of conduct cannot be argued against if it is not explicitly defined. Again, this dubiety of the Party doctrine indicates the way the System is run.

The dehumanization process is a developed form of Napoleon’s operational manipulations in *Animal Farm* and the society built under this control system portrays the world that could arrive in the future.¹⁶ We can also perceive Orwell’s fear of losing humanity in this dehumanization process against which he warns. What is significant, here, is that all of these devices are carried out by the Inner Party members and aimed mainly at the Inner Party members. The rules

¹⁶ Orwell, George. Letter to Mr. Henson. 31 July 1949. *New York Times Book Review*. *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*. eds. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. Vol. 4. New York: Penguin Books, 1978. 564.

are not applied to the Proles as much as to the members of the Inner Party. We can spot Orwell's complex attitude toward the class system from this different treatment of the Inner Party members and the Proles. This will be investigated further in the next chapter.

CHAPTER IV

Individuals inside the System

With the help of the intricate control system, a suffocating society has been built to fit the agenda of the Party, and individuals are dehumanized and made “automaton” (Thorp 16). In this chapter, each individual inside the System is investigated in terms of different features that they exhibit as the result of the dehumanization process. The Inner Party members, the elite group in Oceania, are deeply involved in the works of the Party, and thus hold the most capability of leading a revolt. However, they are converted according to the agenda of the Party; they are either completely dehumanized or reared as dissidents; O’Brien and Katharine are examples of completely dehumanized individuals while Winston and Julia work as dissidents, the resisting individuals. These individuals of two contrasting features are, nonetheless, all alike in that they are exploited by and subsumed into the System without their own individuality. They are no more than mere operational elements of the System that are exploited and discarded. On the other hand, Proles are relatively less restrained while all the *rules* are mainly applied to the Inner Party members to the utmost extent. This different treatment of Proles and the Inner Party members clearly suggests Orwell’s complex attitude toward these classes. By looking at the distinct features of

dehumanized individuals and the contrasting treatment of different classes, this chapter will provide a deeper understanding into the essence of the System as well as Orwell's view on the class system.

O'Brien plays a role of a Party representative with his position deep inside the System. As he represents the System and carries out all the deeds for the System, he is an example of complete dehumanization. From the way he tortures Winston, we learn that he is the System itself. He has been behind all the ordeals that Winston went through:

It was O'Brien who was directing everything. It was he who set the guards onto Winston and who prevented them from killing him. It was he who decided when Winston should scream with pain, when he should have a respite, when he should be fed, when he should sleep, when the drugs should be pumped into his arm. It was he who asked the questions and suggested the answers. He was the tormentor, he was the protector, he was the inquisitor, he was the friend. (243)

He shows neither any humane feelings toward Winston, nor any signs of introspection. He has internalized the Party doctrine to the full extent. He is a complete automaton, but a very intelligent one. He displays a very keen insight into human nature which he uses to control another human being. This knowledge of human nature and various instances with Winston suggests that he

is a very intelligent human being. However, O'Brien uses his intelligence only for the sake of the Party as he is the power-mongering System itself. He is also the symbol of the mindless elite group that only pursues power while disregarding their role as intellectuals in the society. Although they have intellectual power, they do not use it for the public good. They only work as active agents for the System where they belong and seek their own profits. From this portrait of the self-interested elite group, we can read Orwell's discontent and frustration with the intellectuals in the society.

Katharine, O'Brien's counterpart, is another perfect example of a dehumanized individual who is soaked with the Party doctrine to the bone. Katharine, in the memory of Winston, seems "frozen forever by the hypnotic power of the Party" (67). In his remembrance, she "had not a thought in her head that was not a slogan, and there was no imbecility, absolutely none, that she was not capable of swallowing if the Party handed it out to her" (66). Winston complains that "he could have endured living with her if it had not been for just one thing – sex" (66). During the sexual intercourse of which sole purpose is to beget children for the Party, Katharine is like a stone, incapable of feeling any pleasure from the physical contact with another human being. As he holds her stiff body, Winston feels much perplexed and disheartened. Katharine is an example of general female member of the Party. In the society of Oceania:

But a real love affair was an almost unthinkable event. The

women of the Party were all alike. Chastity was as deeply ingrained in them as Party loyalty. By careful early conditioning, by games and cold water, by the rubbish that was dinned into them at school and in the Spies and the Youth League, by lectures, parades, songs, slogans, and martial music, the natural feeling had been driven out of them. (67-68)

This general picture of women in Oceania is the expected and intended result of the Party's control device. They are incapable of feeling humane sentiments. They have been indoctrinated and their life is all about following the rules of the Party. Katharine, as the main female example of dehumanized individuals, is distinguished from O'Brien for her passive, machinelike characteristics. While O'Brien is an active agent of the Party that carries out all the deeds, Katharine is a dull, submissive automaton with "the most stupid, vulgar, empty mind" (66). This description of Katharine as a representative example of women in Oceania seems problematic along with the other important female character, Julia.

Julia is an example of female dissidents compared with Winston, our resisting protagonist. She is a very active, daring, smart elite who uses her knowledge of how the System works to enjoy her life safely within the social boundary. The number-one priority in her life is her own pleasure; she doesn't hesitate to carry out dangerous acts in an attempt to gain what she wants. Her passion for joy of life never stops her from putting herself into dangerous

situations. It was she that initiated the secret love affair with Winston by handing him a simple note. For secret meetings with Winston, she gives out complex directions to a safe place that ensures as much safety as possible. She goes around the proletarian quarters to buy things that are forbidden to Party members such as makeup materials and clothes just for fun. She does all these delinquencies with her cleverness in hiding her true-self and pretending to be an automaton like Katharine. She also shows better insight and knowledge than Winston, which explains her flexibility in her thinking and adroitness in her way of life under the harsh eye of the Party. Walking a tightrope across the Party doctrine, she plays being an ‘automaton’ well throughout the story in a tug-of-war against the Party. However, despite her deep insight into why the Party enforces certain policies, Julia has no interest in the ultimate ‘why’ of the System. Contrary to Winston who is obsessed with truths and desperate to find out the ultimate reason, she is happy-go-lucky as long as she can enjoy her life.

One may complain that females in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* are either rigid or licentious as Patai contends that they are either “antisex freaks or prole prostitutes” (67). It is, in part, true, because Katharine and Julia, the only examples of females in Oceania, are quite different from their male counterparts in their courses of action. It seems valid to read Orwell’s sexual prejudice against females in this aspect. However, because he also shows different male characters that are also dull automatons, self-interested intellectuals and so on, I refuse to

take the gender frame in the argument of this paper. I argue that all kinds of individuals in this System are nonetheless the same – they are only the operating elements of the System.

While Julia is a playful dissident disguised beneath the mask of a complete conformist who finds a way to live a life within the social boundary, Winston is an agonizing dissident stuck in his own world of suspicion against the Party. In the beginning of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, we learn that he has a great obsession with recording his thoughts and fear of forgetting the past and the present. Even though keeping a diary is an act that “would be punished by death, or at least by twenty-five years in a forced-labor camp” (6), he feels an irresistible urge to write about his fading memory and observations of the present. As an Inner Party member who is involved in the manipulation of records, he questions the relativity of truths he deals with and works himself up with arduous curiosity over the boundary between truth and falsity. When he is alone, he spends most of time wondering and daydreaming. Although he holds deep hatred and enmity toward the Party and dreams of revolution, he does not take any action on his own. The biggest revolting deed he ever tries is journal keeping, but what he writes is not much of importance, as it is usually repetition of some words that linger in his mind. For example, he scribbles on his diary:

*theyll shoot me i don't care theyll shoot me in the back of the neck
i don't care down with big brother they always shoot you in the*

back of the neck i don't care down with big brother— (19).

It is rather his own method of relieving his anxiety than an active behavior that might bring about a change in the world. In a way, he is a hero that believes in the value of absolute truth and good, but he is an incompetent elite that only writes of his provocative thoughts in secret. He is an example of a revolution-dreaming elite who is stuck in his own world that eventually ends up being exploited and abandoned by the System. He ponders upon life, but lacks the keen insight that Julia has. As a result, he is fooled and deceived by the illusions that O'Brien manipulates. He is a good-intentioned individual who dreams of a better future, but his lack of action and determination brings no change. He only hopes that Proles would do something, as he believes they hold such potential. At the same time, he despairs at the recognition of their incompetence. His habit of thinking without action leads him to be the dissident that is used only according to the agenda of the Party. He follows O'Brien without any doubts about the practicality of the Brotherhood's deeds. His illusive obsession with the past and the present realities leaves him in his own world, and this itself leads him to be a victim exploited in the operation of the System. How he is cultivated into a resisting individual will be explored further with details in the next chapter.

The elite individuals that Orwell portrays in the book are either completely dehumanized or allowed dissidents. The completely dehumanized elites are categorized by two characteristics, either active, representative agents or passive

automatons. They have adopted the Party doctrine to the fullest and thus live according to their indoctrinated belief. It is obvious that they would not do anything that could possibly change the world. Then the hope lies on the dissidents, but they are either self-interested or good-intentioned daydreaming individuals that are only exploited and removed according to the agenda of the Party. Although these elites hold the potentiality of bringing up a rebellion and tearing down the Party, their inability to take an action only adds to the relinquishment of hope. This is the picture of the elite group and it is very disturbing to recognize their own inability and the Party's exploitation.

Winston says that "If there is hope, it lies in the proles" (69) in the belief that Proles possess the power to overthrow the Party. However at the same time, he feels that it is impossible for the Proles to recognize their power, which only adds to his despair. They should be awakened first to give rise to a social turnover, but without a revolution, they would not be awakened. Winston notes "until they become conscious they will never rebel, and until after they have rebelled they cannot become conscious" (70). The revolution can come true only under the condition that they are "conscious of their own strength" (69). Without a chance to be awakened or raise a rebellion, Proles remain "eyeless creature[s] with the quacking voice" (61) and there would never be a need to vaporize them.

Proles take up 85 percent of Oceanian population and considered "natural inferiors who must be kept in subjugation, like animals, by the application of a

few simple rules” (71). Due to their alleged status parallel to animals, “no attempt to indoctrinate [them] with the ideology of the Party” (71) is made. Compared to the complex control system used for Party members, relatively simple devices are used for Proles. To some extent, Proles are even allowed to lead their own private lives. They have means to entertain themselves with the Proletarian literature, music, and drama. With no telescreen at home, they follow ancestral code of living (72). There is no sexual Puritanism, no punishment on promiscuity, and even divorce is permitted. Prostitution is even encouraged as an outlet of instincts (65). They often fall into frenzies of patriotism without knowing the target. Such ignorant arousal symbolizes the state of the Proles; they remember some details, but not the whole prospect of life before the Revolution (93), just like the animal public in *Animal Farm*. Even with the less degree of supervision upon them, they are not the active operators of their life. Rather, they seem to follow a certain defined pattern of life: they are born and grow up in the gutters, go to work at 12, get married at 20, and die at 60. This portrait of Proles bears no reason for the Party to worry about them, and thus no hope for Winston.

The contrast in treatment between the members of the Inner Party and the Proles reveals Orwell’s views on the elite group and the working-class people. First, his attitude toward the working class is ironical. He feels sympathy and agony with the working class and cherishes their values, but he deems them

“brutal and repulsive.”¹⁷ He believes in the power that the working class has, but he does not think they would be able to know how to use it. Accordingly, the treatment of Proles as animals shows his despair for their ignorance and inactiveness. As opposed to the Proles, Winston is a member of the Inner Party, the elite group in Oceania that deals with the work of the ruling Party. All the intricate devices explored in the previous chapter that are applied mainly to the Inner Party members reveal the degree of importance Orwell puts on the elites. In fact, his attitude is rather ironical, because he trusts elites more than the working class for what they could do, but despises them for their actual roles in the System. As they are at the heart of the System, they are the ones who can have the chance to bring about a change. However, they are only controlled and deceived, unable to stand against the Party. For this, Orwell blames the intellectuals for what is happening in the world, and holds cynicism toward them. It is probably because he is aware that the ruling party is, after all, a group of elites that only think for their own sake. Having Winston as an elite protagonist and killing him off after showing how he is exploited for the operation of the System could be a warning for intellectuals around the world to be aware of the dangerous working principles of the System.

¹⁷ *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*. eds. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. Vol. 2. New York: Penguin Books, 1978. 142-143.

CHAPTER V

The Working Principle of the System

Through the example of *Animal Farm*, we have looked at how social classes are built and how a group of elite individuals lose their individuality once they become a ruling party. While the ultimate ruler of the System is replaced, nothing much changes for the general public. This replaceable nature of the ruler signifies that it lacks its own individuality inside the System. In *Animal Farm*, it does not matter if the owner is Mr. Jones or Napoleon. The System stays the same and the working class always suffers. Subsumed into the System, individuals, especially elites, lose their unique individuality and only play a role as an agent for the collectivity of the System. This notion of annihilated individuality is developed further in *Nineteen Eighty Four*.

While the story of *Animal Farm* is about ‘becoming’ of a ruling party, *Nineteen Eighty Four* is about the working principle of the System. It shows how the Party not only allows dissidence but even brings up dissidents in order to annihilate individuality. The ultimate purpose of the Party is to achieve, retain, and exert utmost power over the society and its people. This is quite different from what Winston used to think. He has been asking ‘why’ to all the control devices that the Party uses to manipulate the present realities. He notes that he

understands “immediate advantages of falsifying the past” but to him “the ultimate motive was mysterious” (79). About the ultimate motive, Squealer in *Animal Farm* has always given an excuse that what they, the pigs, do is only for the sake of the general animals as a whole group. This is also the answer Winston thinks he would hear from O’Brien about the aims of the Party:

He knew in advance what O’Brien would say: that the Party did not seek power for its own ends, but only for the good of the majority. That it sought power because men in the mass were frail, cowardly creatures who could not endure liberty or face the truth, and must be ruled over and systematically deceived by others who were stronger than themselves. That the choice for mankind lay between freedom and happiness, and that, for the great bulk of mankind, happiness was better. That the Party was the eternal guardian of the weak, a dedicated sect doing evil that good might come, sacrificing its own happiness to that of others. (262)

This is what is usually given to rationalize the necessity of a ruling system in the society. With this rationalization, a ruling group carries out various kinds of deeds and allegedly claims that it is all for the so-called sake of the public. The underlying assumption of the rationalization is pessimistic in nature, for it dismisses the general public as ignorant followers that should be taken care of by a more intelligent group of people. This pessimism seems to originate from what

Orwell has observed as the reality of the politics while going through personal hardships during the Spanish Civil War. In Spain where he has gone “to fight fascism...as a way of setting his life against an evil and destructive social force” (Williams 31), he wonders about the plausibility of objective truth and agonizes for its failure. In his essay, “Looking Back on the Spanish War,” he notes:

Early in my life, I had noticed that no event is ever correctly reported in a newspaper, but in Spain, for the first time, I saw newspaper reports which did not bear any relation to the facts, not even the relationships which is implied in an ordinary lie. I saw great battles reported where there had been no fighting, and complete silence where hundreds of men had been killed. I saw troops who had fought bravely denounced as cowards and traitors, and other who had never seen a shot fired hailed as the heroes of imaginary victories; and I saw newspapers in London retailing these lies and eager intellectuals building emotional superstructures over events that had never happened. (294)

He has witnessed how the government deceives the public with manipulated truths and fabricated lies and despaired at how the public has lost the power to recognize what is actually taking place. It seems safe to contend that Orwell’s experience in the Spanish Civil War has influenced the maneuvered world of Oceania in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and his pessimistic view toward the public. The

rationalization of the necessity of a ruling system in the society that Winston assumes to hear from O'Brien is, then, what the public has been made to believe.

However, the true nature of a ruling system that Orwell wants to reveal is evinced in O'Brien's remark later in the story. It is in the Ministry of Love, amidst dreadful torture, that Winston finally solves his all-time mystery of 'why'. During the interrogation, O'Brien answers him:

The Party seeks power entirely for its own sake. We are not interested in the good of others; we are interested solely in power. Not wealth or luxury or long life or happiness; only power, pure power. Power is not a means; it is an end. One does not establish a dictatorship in order to safeguard a revolution; one makes the revolution in order to establish the dictatorship. The object of persecution is persecution. The object of torture is torture. The object of power is power. (263)

The System exists solely for its egotistic reason – to gain and exert power. This explains why a resisting individual is essential in its operation. Exerting power over a subject who has already succumbed is pointless. Power proves its influence when it tramples over a revolting mind. The Party, therefore, deliberately cultivates a resisting individual, a dissident, so that it could completely dehumanize, remove human essence, and finally pulverize the individuality.

Allowing dissidence means allowing individuals to build a relationship with and win trust from other human beings as it is the direct defiance against the Party principle of keeping isolation. It is to bring out the human essence deep inside of them. Complete pulverization of individuality requires removal of everything that makes an individual human. In the book, the quality that makes one human is loyalty, which can be found in Proles:

They were governed by private loyalties which they did not question. What mattered were individual relationships, and a completely helpless gesture, an embrace, a tear, a word spoken to a dying man, could have value in itself. ... They were not loyal to a party or a country or an idea, they were loyal to one another. ... They had held on to the primitive emotions which [Winston] himself had to relearn by conscious effort. (165)

In the society where everyone is forced to be subjugated to the Party, Proles are the only ones that have remained loyal to each other. This is the power that Winston believes to reside in the Proles, as it can be seen in the phrase “If there is hope, it lies in the proles” (69) which frequently occurs throughout his monologues. Loyalty is the ultimate human attribute that does not need to be questioned. Rather than “a party or a country or an idea,” relationships hold much value for them. In other words, it is the power to know and look at others in a private relationship and accept them for who they are. Being loyal to each

other means to hold sincerity to one another and never allow betrayal from heart. The human strength lies in the essence of bonding relationships where each takes care of one another while holding solid loyalties toward each other. With this, Proles may have the strength to overthrow the System under the condition that they be “conscious of their own strength” (69). However, the Party does not bother to remove their individuality, because Proles hold no potential to grow into resisting individuals as observed in the previous chapter. In the tightly controlled world of Oceania, it is impossible for them to be conscious. This is why Winston hopelessly despairs, thinking “until they become conscious they will never rebel, and until after they have rebelled they cannot become conscious” (70).

Recognizing and lamenting the potential strength in Proles, Winston says that he and Julia are not human, since they lack loyalty toward other human beings. However, once he gains support and trust from O’Brien and supposedly from the Brotherhood and falls in love with Julia, his human essence manifests itself into deep loyalty toward people he believes on his side. Especially, his love for Julia keeps him stay human; as long as he holds onto the loyalty toward her deep inside his heart, he is human. He tells her, “Confession is not betrayal. What you say or do doesn’t matter; only feelings matter. If they could make me stop loving you – that would be the real betrayal” (166). He recognizes the deep affection that he feels toward Julia and learns that it builds a sense of loyalty in

him. What he says would not matter if he keeps loyalty toward Julia deep in his heart. He would still stay human, and it would not be a victory on the part of the Party. This remark shows his strong belief that the Party cannot do anything about deep feelings that humans have. It also shows that Winston has become a resisting individual with loyalty that the Party wants.

In the world of Oceania, however, the society is too tightly controlled for people to be a rebellion on their own. Even if the Inner Party members develop suspicion and exhibit potential to deviate from the Party doctrine, they cannot have confidence in their conviction due to their isolatedness. Without any external support, it is hard to hold a personal belief strongly enough to take action. As his job heavily pertains to the manipulation of the present realities, Winston grows to be skeptical of the world in which he is living. He starts to do things that are forbidden such as keeping a personal journal. However, as mentioned in the previous chapter, all he can do is writing, in secret, about his suspicion. It is hard for him to be sure of his own conviction; he keeps asking about the world around him but never finds a way to dispel his doubts. Consequently, he starts to question his own thinking and existence:

He wondered, as he had many times wondered before, whether he himself was a lunatic. Perhaps a lunatic was simply a minority of one. At one time it had been a sign of madness to believe that the earth goes around the sun; today, to believe that the past is

unalterable. He might be *alone* in holding that belief, and if alone, then a lunatic. But the thought of being a lunatic did not greatly trouble him; the horror was that he might also be wrong. (80)

As observed in Chapter Three, it is how the Party keeps the Inner Party members under control; it keeps them under constant suspicions so that they would not gain any sense of security. Winston becomes desperate for proof to support his conviction, and as a result starts to have illusions which seem to have been deliberately implanted by the Party. In a dream seven years ago, he hears a passer-by saying “We shall meet in the place where there is no darkness” (25). He positively takes the remark, and assumes that the place with no darkness would be somewhere pleasant apart from the hopeless world of Oceania. He believes that it was O’Brien without any supporting evidence and starts to have “a link of understanding” with him that is “more important than affection or partisanship” (25). This belief takes a firm footing in Winston’s mind when he visits O’Brien to join the Brotherhood, the alleged underground resistance force. When he says they would meet “in the place where there is no darkness,” O’Brien responds with the phrase “without appearance of surprise” as if he has “recognized the allusion” (178). Taking O’Brien’s words without any doubt, Winston clings to a false hope that the Brotherhood is real and that revolution would be possible. It is a false hope, because the Brotherhood is one of the Party’s means to bring up dissidents like Winston. Everything related to

Brotherhood is carefully constructed by O'Brien, who also turns out to be the real writer of *the Book*, whose writer has originally been announced to be Goldstein. This is evidence that the Party deliberately allows dissidence and resists individuals. They even write up a whole book to lure dissidents and deceive them with the concocted fantasy of Brotherhood.

Around the time when Winston has been putting his suspicion into journal entries in secret, Julia approaches him. She is a harmless dissident who is only interested in her own enjoyment apart from the suffocating life in Oceania. She is harmless because she does not dream of rebellion; she seems satisfied as long as she has her desires satisfied. She senses some unusual air around Winston and is assured that he is safe to accompany in her secret deviation. As an expert of light delinquencies in her life, she manages to hand Winston a message with *I love you* written on it. Before unfolding the message, Winston suspects it as a political message and thinks she must have come either from Thought Police or Brotherhood. But, as soon as he reads the message, a very different emotion emerges in him:

At the sight of *I love you* the desire to stay alive had welled up in him, and the taking of minor risks suddenly seemed stupid. (109)

The “desire to stay alive” may be taken as a romantic reaction, but later it is revealed that it has only been his political hope. When Julia tells him that she has been with many other Party members, he is filled with excitement, not with jealousy:

Anything that hinted at corruption always filled him with a wild hope. Who knew? Perhaps the Party was rotten under the surface, its cult of strenuousness and self-denial simply a sham concealing iniquity. If he could have infected the whole lot of them with leprosy or syphilis, how gladly he would have done so! Anything to rot, to weaken, to undermine! (125)

He is thrilled at the possibility of the Party being “rotten”. Because having a desire or any kind of feeling for other human beings is forbidden in the Oceanic society, he believes that human desire is “the force that would tear the Party to pieces” (127). Therefore, he gladly has a sexual intercourse with Julia:

But you could not have pure love or pure lust nowadays. No emotion was pure, because everything was mixed up with fear and hatred. Their embrace had been a battle, the climax a victory.

It was a blow struck against the Party. It was a political act. (127)

At this time, spending time with Julia is “a political act” against the Party; it is a revolting action targeted at the Party’s efforts to remove all the contacts between the Inner Party members. However, as times goes on, he truly falls in love with her. As his feelings develop, he feels a variety of complex feelings of love such as jealousy and desperate needs to be with her. Most importantly, the feelings of love and intimacy change him:

Winston had dropped his habit of drinking gin at all hours. He

seemed to have lost the need for it. He had grown fatter, his varicose ulcer had subsided, leaving only a brown stain on the skin above his ankle, his fits of coughing in the early morning had stopped. The process of life had ceased to be intolerable, he had no longer any impulse to make faces at the telescreen or shout curses at the top of his voice. Now that they had a secure hiding place, almost a home, it did not even seem a hardship that they could only meet infrequently and for a couple of hours at a time.

(150)

At the safe hiding place with Julia where he can enjoy their own privacy, Winston gains a sense of stability and therefore becomes free of volatile feelings such as anger and restlessness. This psychological stability results in better physical conditions.

To take a step further to be a true rebel, Winston goes to O'Brien's place with Julia for a secret meeting to join the Brotherhood. He pledges his loyalty toward the Brotherhood by making an oath to all the atrocities that he would do for its sake. It is the recognition of himself as a resisting individual with no more of doubt about his convictions of the painful truth about the Party and thus the Brotherhood. His arduous reading of *the Book* also signifies his stubborn belief in the Brotherhood; he gains confidence in his rebellious imagination that it would be possible to overturn the Party someday and set things right in order.

Building a meaningful relationship with Julia and participating in the Brotherhood has given Winston a chance to be a true rebellion with loyalty deep inside his heart. Nonetheless, this is what the Party wants. Now the transformation of Winston from a confused spirit to a confident rebellion full of hope is complete, and so it is time for the Party to remove the human essence in him. Loyalty, the human essence, is a very powerful value that would be removed only when the individual is driven to extremity. To do so, the System needs to know the point of vulnerability that is specific to the individual. The point of vulnerability is something for which one falls in ultimate fear and wants to do anything to avoid. It is a very private matter that is distinct in each different individual, and thus it is not easily found. In Winston's case, the Party waits for seven years to learn about his point of vulnerability while cultivating him into a resisting individual. Winston's point of vulnerability turns out to be 'rats;' he abhors and fears them more than anything in the world. When he is spending time with Julia in their own secret place, she tells him that she has chased a rat away, and Winston freaks out, shouting "Of all horrors in the world – a rat!" (144). The Party has finally learned what scares Winston the most through the telescreen that was thought to be nowhere in the hiding place. Before long, the Party arrests Winston and Julia, and takes them to the Ministry of Love.

After Winston is separated from Julia and dragged to the Ministry of Love, all the interactions with O'Brien are cleared up. Once inside the ministry,

Winston realizes the true meaning of the “place where there is no darkness.” It is the Ministry of Love:

In this place, he knew instinctively, the lights would never be turned out. It was the place with no darkness: he saw now why O’Brien had seemed to recognize the allusion. In the Ministry of Love there were no windows. (229)

Since O’Brien has been behind all that Winston goes through, it is safe to conclude that O’Brien is also responsible for the illusion that Winston has come to have in the beginning. The phrase about the place with no darkness has been used to form a false hope in Winston’s mind and to build the companionship with O’Brien. Moreover, O’Brien has won Winston’s trust and used it to have Winston make an oath to do all the evils for the sake of the Brotherhood. Winston’s oath-making later fires back at him as a counterattack in the Room 101 when O’Brien induces him to come to the harsh realization that he is no better than the Party that he abominates. This notion seems to originate from Orwell’s personal experience as it appears in one of his essays on the Spanish Civil War. He writes, “Everyone believes in the atrocities of the enemy and disbelieves in those of his own side, without ever bothering to examine the evidence” (“Looking Back on the Spanish War” 289). The blurred line between “enemy” and “own side” reveals Orwell’s constant struggle with the doubts against the subjectivity of justice and truth, which is well projected in Winston’s

oath-making.

At the Ministry of Love, all the connections with the outside are severed; all the information regarding the place or time is cut off from the prisoners who are doomed to go through a variety of tortures. With the sense of place and the concept of time all lost, they start to lose the sense of reality and the confidence in their own self identity. Tortures are, according to O'Brien, the healing treatment for "reintegration" (260) in which defiant individuals go through three stages: learning, understanding, and acceptance. In the learning session, physical tortures including non-stop interrogations are applied to elicit confessions. It is in the understanding stage that Winston learns the long-awaited answer for "why" the Party should exist.

After the tortures elicit physical deterioration, psychological despair and intellectual numbing take place. From this, individuals are brought down to the level of animals. With the deformed body and hopeless mind, they have nothing left but the ultimate human essence – loyalty. When O'Brien pinpoints how Winston has been defeated, Winston confronts him with the little dignity left in him:

"We have beaten you, Winston. We have broken you up. You have seen what your body is like. Your mind is in the same state. I do not think there can be much pride left in you. You have been kicked and flogged and insulted, you have screamed with pain, you have rolled on the floor in your own blood and vomit. You

have whimpered for mercy, you have betrayed everybody and everything. Can you think of a single degradation that has not happened to you?”

Winston has stopped weeping, though the tears were still oozing out of his eyes. He looked up at O’Brien.

“I have not betrayed Julia,” he said. (273)

Loyalty is the strongest when it is manifested into deep affection toward the specific other. The greater the loyalty is, the more definite the removal of it will be. For Winston, there is dear Julia to whom he has vowed his true loyalty and love. Then, it is time to be dragged into the Room 101 which everyone, knowing its purpose and significance, seems to dread. When Winston is taken to the Room 101, the Party uses its knowledge of his point of vulnerability – rats. At the sight of approaching rats, Winston finally gives up the loyalty he has been cherishing for his significant other and forsakes his value of being a human. Due to the unbearable torture, he abandons his love for Julia, which is the “real betrayal” (166). Without his loyalty toward Julia, he cannot stay human anymore. When he is eventually forced to let go of the last value he has been holding toward his beloved ones, he gives up being a human.

With the loyalty completely removed, the dehumanization is truly accomplished and the Party has no more of deeds to carry out for Winston. At the completion of dehumanization, he becomes at once useless for the Party which,

therefore, kills him off at the end of the book. Once completely subsumed into the Party doctrine with individuality lost, Winston holds no significance for the Party, and therefore is killed. This killing of Winston whom the Party has paid time and efforts to *cure* proves that pulverizing individuality is the ends. This peculiar human being that has human essence is an indispensable constituent of the System and its removal is the working principle of the System. It is run by removing individuality of individuals inside. To do this, the System deliberately allows and brings up resisting individuals only to remove their human essence and deprive them of their own individuality.

The System is also run by an assembly of individuals, who are power-hungry. Similarly, in this group, individuality is annihilated and only the group identity remains. Having no individuality means that the positions are replaceable. Mr. Jones is replaced by Napoleon in *Animal Farm*. In *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, it does not matter who the Big Brother is. As long as the illusion of the Big Brother's presence remains intact, it does not require a particular individuality. Either dominant or subordinate, individuals hold the same degree of importance inside the System. Their individuality is annihilated and the process itself runs the System. The elite group, the Inner Party members in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* and the pigs in *Animal Farm*, has a better chance of becoming conscious and bring out a change, but they are only actively exploited in the operation of the System. They lose their individuality through the intricate

control system as the Party tries to remove the smallest possibility of a political over-turn and rather allows dissidence in order to run the System. To his acute despair, Orwell realizes that any kind of individual efforts out of good will is insufficient for the society to overturn and change for a better world. Individuals cannot effectuate the social reform. He cherishes the sense of diligence and hard work of the working class and despises the greed of power-hungry elite individuals who only care about building a system where they can be ruling. At the same time, however, he does not hold a belief in the working class's capability of raising a rebellion and blames the elite group for being exploited and losing individuality all the same inside the System.

In conclusion, individual resistance itself is another functional element of the society. The System cultivates resisting individuals under the tight control of the society, exploits them to the point of complete submission, and terminates them as they become useless without the ultimate human essence. Even more dreadfully, the individuals in the ruling party that run the System also lose their individuality. Inside the System, all the individuals, high or low, lose their essential individuality, and this is the true horror of a political system.

There is no principal agent that independently operates the System. If there is no clear main body, no one is taking the responsibility for the wrongdoings of the System and it would be utterly impossible to change or break the System. With this interpretation of the System, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* reads as more intensified

pessimism manifested through Orwell's deep insight into the nature of the ruling System in the society. Based on his personal experiences and his novels, this is the nature of any kind of a political system in Orwell's eyes. From the death of Winston, we read of Orwell's abysmal disgust for the idea of one's dominion over one another, which is the bottom line of every system.

Chapter VI

Conclusion

We have looked at the perils of the System that George Orwell warns against in his novel, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, along with a peripheral attention to his another novel, *Animal Farm*. The fable of *Animal Farm* shows how the spirit of good-intentioned revolutionaries slowly becomes ruined and distorted and lays a foundation for dictatorship by a power-hungry individual. It is a story of the formation of the System that suppresses and exploits the individuals inside to the point that it subsumes and eliminates their individuality. It is a brilliant allegory of Stalinism in Russia that shows the status quo, but it does not go deeper into the underlying reasons. This is solved in the next and last novel of Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, which explains the ultimate aims and why of the System. The book elucidates how the power-hungry System uses a variety of control devices to dehumanize individuals and how it rears a resisting individual only to pulverize him/her so that it could use the process to run itself. Individuals attempt to resist the oppression of the System, but the resisting act itself has been a part of the agenda. Dissidence is encouraged and allowed to the point that it could be recognized and pulverized in order to operate the System. Individuals, after all, are consumed, exploited and finally removed.

This goes in line with the subversion-containment theory that New Historicism argues for. It is first introduced in Stephen Greenblatt's essay, "Invisible Bullets". By studying Thomas Harriot's report on the colony in Virginia, he came up with the theory and used it to analyze Shakespeare's history plays. He argues:

the subversiveness that is genuine and radical – sufficiently disturbing so that to be suspected of it could lead to imprisonment and torture – is at the same time contained by the power it would appear to threaten. Indeed the subversiveness is the very product of that power and furthers its ends. (30)

He recognizes that "this capacity of the dominant order to generate subversion so as to use it to its own ends marks 'the very condition of power'" (Montrose 8). Likewise, I have argued that the System in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* deliberately allows and even produces subversion only to contain it, and the act itself is the working principle of the System. No matter how hard individuals attempt to bring a rebellion, the subversion itself is contained without any change. This is the true horror of the System that Orwell warns us against.

Specifically, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* is a pessimistic warning mainly targeted at the elite group. Rodden also notes that "Orwell and his work constitute not only a sociological but also an ethical guide to the contemporary relation of the intellectual and politics" ("On the Political Sociology of Intellectuals" 253). At

the same time, it is an exhortation to working class people that emphasizes the importance of awakening. Winston frequently says “If there is hope, it lies in the proles” only if they can be “conscious of their own strength” (69). This is the message he delivers to the working class through the realistic portrait of ignorant Proles.

Moreover, the book holds much significance for today’s readers as well. As can be seen in Chapter Three, the world of Oceania shares certain aspects of life with the Digital Age we are living in now. Since the publication of *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, the Big Brother has long been a widespread metaphor for any type of surveillance on the public. Especially in the Digital Age, it has become a metaphor for surveillance on privacy with the use of technical devices. Will Thomas DeVries notes that “Orwell’s vision of an all-seeing, ever-searching, omnipresent eye of government has dominated the metaphoric landscape of the modern privacy debate” (293) and “Big Brother metaphor lives on in the digital age – and now Big Brother actually possesses the technological and legislative tools to prevent any meaningful escape from his gaze” (294). As noticed, it holds special weight for this age. If the Big Brother in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* lives only as a giant face and staring eyes in the wall, now he has all the devices to virtually follow every action of individuals. His most powerful device in this age is, of course, the computer. U.S. Supreme Court Justice William Douglas has stated that “we live in an Orwellian age in which the computer has become ‘the heart of

a surveillance system that will turn society into a transparent world'¹⁸¹⁹.

In this “transparent world,” it is becoming more and more difficult for us to have our own privacy. Under the name of safety and security, closed-circuit televisions are everywhere filming every action of every unspecified individual. With the advent of smart phone which allows an easy access to the Internet, the virtual world is growing bigger to create more chances for individual users to be traced and laid open. Daniel J. Solove observes that “we are being watched, but we do not know when or to what extent” (31). Similar to the telescreen in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*, this overly open world brings up an invisible Panopticon, the famous device of discipline which is introduced by Jeremy Bentham and developed by Michel Foucault. Solove notices the close relation between the telescreen and the Internet and argues that they work as the Panopticon. They create a similar effect:

By always being visible, by constantly living under the reality that one could be observed at any time, people assimilate the effects of surveillance into themselves. They obey not because they are monitored but because of their fear that they could be watched.

This fear alone is sufficient to achieve control. (31)

¹⁸ Miller, Arthur R. “Computers, Data Banks and Individual Privacy: An Overview” *Columbia Human Rights Law Review* 4 (1972):1-12.

¹⁹ Case Record of *Sampson v. Murray* – 415 U.S. 61 (1974) retrieved from Justia US Supreme Court. Web. 13 May. 2014. <http://supreme.justia.com/cases/federal/us/415/61/case.html>.

People in Oceania, surrounded by telescreens, are under constant control achieved by their own fear. People in this Internet-dominated age are already little agitated for their growing suspicion that they are being watched, tracked, and controlled. The prescience of the operation system of today's Digital Age in *Nineteen Eighty-Four* conveys great significance, and therefore gives many reasons for us to dwell on the various issues presented in the novel. It is we ourselves that need to bear Orwell's warning and exhortation in mind, and it is only by us that the world foreseen cannot come into being in any kind of form.

WORKS CITED

- Arendt, Hannah. "Ideology and Terror: A Novel Form of Government." *Review of Politics* (July 1953), reprinted in *Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four: Text, Sources, Criticism*. Ed. Irving Howe. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963. 256-270.
- Brin, David. "The Self-Preventing Prophecy; or, How a Dose of Nightmare Can Help Tame Tomorrow's Perils." *On Nineteen Eighty-Four*. eds. Abbott Gleason, Jack Goldsmith, and Martha C. Nussbaum. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2005. 222-230.
- Crick, Bernard. "Nineteen Eighty-Four: Context and Controversy." *The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell*. Ed. John Rodden. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 146-159.
- Deutscher, Isaac. "1984-The Mysticism of Cruelty." *George Orwell. A Collection of Critical Essays* (1974): 119-132.
- Devries, Will Thomas. "Protecting Privacy in the Digital Age." *Berkeley Technology Law Journal* 18 (2003): 283-311.
- Dickstein, Morris. "Animal Farm: History as Fable." *The Cambridge Companion to George Orwell*. Ed. John Rodden. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2007. 133-145.

- Fromm, Erich. Afterword. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. By George Orwell. 1961. New York: Signet Classics, 1977. 313-326.
- Fyvel, T. R. "A Writer's Life." *World Review* (Mar. 1950), reprinted in *Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four: Text, Sources, Criticism*. Ed. Irving Howe. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963. 239-248.
- Goldstein, Philip. "Orwell as a (Neo)conservative: The Reception of 1984." *The Journal of the Midwest Modern Language Association* 33.1 (2000): 44-57.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. "Invisible Bullets." *Shakespearean Negotiations*. By Greenblatt. Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1988. 21-65.
- Hall, Stuart. "Conjuring Leviathan: Orwell on the State." *Inside The Myth*. Ed. Christopher Norris. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1984. 217-241.
- Howe, Irving. "Orwell: History as Nightmare." *The American Scholar* (1956), reprinted as "1984: History as Nightmare" in *Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four: Text, Sources, Criticism*. Ed. Irving Howe. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963. 188-196.
- . "The Fiction of Anti-Utopia." *The New Republic* (April. 1962), reprinted in *Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four: Text, Sources, Criticism*. Ed. Irving Howe. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963. 176-180.

- . "1984: Enigmas of Power." *1984 Revisited: Totalitarianism in Our Century*.
Ed. Irving Howe. New York: Perennial Library, 1983. 3-18.
- Jacob, Alaric. "Sharing Orwell's 'Joys' – But Not His Fears." *Inside The Myth*.
Ed. Christopher Norris. London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1984.
62-84.
- Mann, Golo. *Frankfurter Rundschau* (Nov. 1949), reprinted in *George Orwell: The Critical Heritage*. Ed. Jeffrey Meyers. London: Routledge, 1975. 277-281.
- Miller, Mark Crispin. "The Fate of 1984." *1984 Revisited: Totalitarianism in Our Century*. Ed. Irving Howe. New York: Perennial Library, 1983. 19-46.
- Montrose, Louis. *The Purpose of Playing*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Muggeridge, Malcolm. "The Genesis of 1984." *A Reader's Guide to George Orwell*. Ed. Jeffrey Meyers. London: Thames and Hudson Ltd, 1975. 144-159.
- Orwell, George. Letter to Francis A. Henson. 31 July 1949. *New York Times Book Review. The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*. eds. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. Vol. 4. New York: Penguin Books, 1978. 564.
- . *Animal Farm*. New York: Signet Classics, 1946.

- . *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. New York: Signet Classics, 1949.
- . "Looking Back on the Spanish War." *New Road* (1943), reprinted in *New York Times Book Review. The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*. eds. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. Vol. 2. New York: Penguin Books, 1970. 286-306.
- . "Politics and the English Language." *Horizon* (April 1946), reprinted in *New York Times Book Review. The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*. eds. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. Vol. 4. New York: Penguin Books, 1970. 156-170.
- . "Why I Write." *The Collected Essays, Journalism and Letters of George Orwell*. eds. Sonia Orwell and Ian Angus. Vol. 1. New York: Penguin Books, 1970. 23-30.
- Patai, Daphne. "Gamesmanship and Androcentrism in *Nineteen Eighty-Four*." *Modern Critical Interpretations: George Orwell's 1984*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1987. 47-85.
- Rahv, Philip. "The Unfuture of Utopia." *The Partisan Review* (July 1949), reprinted in *Modern Critical Views: George Orwell*. Ed. Harold Bloom. New York: Chelsea House Publishers, 1987. 13-20.
- Rejali, Darius. "Whom Do You Trust? What Do You Count on?" *On Nineteen Eighty-Four*. eds. Abbott Gleason, Jack Goldsmith, and Martha C. Nussbaum. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2005. 155-179.

- Rodden, John. *The Politics of Literary Reputation*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1989.
- . "On the Political Sociology of Intellectuals: George Orwell and the London Left Intelligentsia of the 1930s." *The Canadian Journal of Sociology* 15.3 (1990): 251-273.
- Rosenfeld, Isaac. "Decency and Death." *Partisan Review* (May 1950), reprinted in *Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four: Text, Sources, Criticism*. Ed. Irving Howe. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963. 185-188.
- Russell, Bertrand. "George Orwell." *World Review* (June 1950), reprinted in *Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four: Text, Sources, Criticism*. Ed. Irving Howe. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963. 237-238.
- Solove, Daniel. J. *The Digital Person: Technology and Privacy in the Information Age*. New York: New York University Press, 2004.
- Thompson, Frank H, Jr. "Orwell's Image of the Man of Good Will." *College English* 22.4 (1961): 235-240.
- Thorp, Malcolm R. "The Dynamics of Terror in Orwell's *1984*." *Brigham Young University Studies* 24.1 (1984): 3-17.
- Tucker, Robert C. "Does Big Brother Really Exist?" *1984 Revisited: Totalitarianism in Our Century*. Ed. Irving Howe. New York: Perennial Library, 1983. 89-102.
- Walsh, James. "George Orwell." *Marxist Quarterly* (Jan. 1956), reprinted in

- Orwell's Nineteen Eighty-Four: Text, Sources, Criticism*. Ed. Irving Howe. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1963. 212-216.
- Walzer, Michael. "On 'Failed Totalitarianism'." *1984 Revisited: Totalitarianism in Our Century*. Ed. Irving Howe. New York: Perennial Library, 1983. 103-121.
- Warburg, Fredric. "1984." *Publisher's Report* (1948), reprinted in *George Orwell: The Critical Heritage*. Ed. Jeffrey Meyers. London: Routledge, 1975. 247-250.
- White, Richard. "George Orwell: Socialism and Utopia." *Utopian Studies* 19.1 (2008): 73-95.
- Williams, Raymond. *George Orwell*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1981.
- Zimbardo, Philip G. "Mind Control in Orwell's *Nineteen Eighty-Four*: Fictional Concepts Become Operational Realities in Jim Jones's Jungle Experiment." *On Nineteen Eighty-Four*. eds. Abbott Gleason, Jack Goldsmith, and Martha C. Nussbaum. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2005. 128-154.

국문초록

정치와 밀접한 연관을 지닌 삶을 살아온 조지 오웰은 그의 마지막 저서인 『1984』에서 지배자 계급, 더 나아가 계급체계 자체에 대한 환멸과 깊은 증오를 드러낸다. 주인공인 윈스턴(Winston)은 당(Party)의 치밀한 계획 하에 ‘저항하는 개인(resisting individual)’으로 길러지고, 이용당하며, 마지막엔 철저히 파괴당하고 버려지는 인물로서, 개인은 단지 운영체제 요소(operating element)에 지나지 않는다는 것을 보여준다. 이러한 체계(System)의 본질과 파괴적인 작동 원리는 오웰의 다른 정치소설인 『동물농장』에서부터 살펴볼 수가 있는데, 이 소설이 집단체계의 형성과정을 보여주기 때문이다. 『동물농장』은 선의를 가지고 시작한 혁명의 꿈이 실제 혁명을 거치면서 어떻게 변질되어가는지를 통해 혁명을 일으킨 후의 세상도 지도자의 이름만 바뀔 뿐 별다른 변화가 일어나지 않음을 보여준다. 이러한 과정 속에서 체계 안에 속하는 개인들은 그저 착취당하고 개체성(individuality)을 몰살당하며 체계의 집단성 속으로 흡수가 되어버리고 만다. 이 주제는 체계의 근본적인 목적과 이유를 파헤치는 『1984』에서 더 발전된 모습으로 드러난다. 당은 갖가지 통제기제들을 통해 사회를 비인간화(dehumanization)하고 이러한 결과로서 비인간화된 개인과 저항하는 개인이 탄생하게 된다. 이러한 비인간화를 유도하는 기제들과 이렇게 연루된 개인들의 다양한 반응을 살펴보면 집단체계가 의도적으로 반체제적 저항(dissidence)을 허용하면서 자신의 체제 질서를 유지, 운영해간

다는 결론에 도달한다. 개인들을 억압하고 통제하여 그들로 하여금 저항하고 맞서 싸우도록 유도하는, 즉 의도적 반체제 행위의 육성 속에서 집단체제는 자신의 온전한 억압기제들을 유지할 수 있는 것이다. 결국 모든 저항은 이미 계획되고 용납된 것이며 개인들은 그들이 노력을 쏟는 저항과 관계없이 그저 이용당하고 개체성이 몰살당한 채로 체계 안으로 흡수되어가는 것이다. 이는 오웰이 세상을 향해 내던지는 굉장히 비관적인 경고라고 할 수 있다.

주요어 : 저항하는 개인, 운영체제요소, 체계, 개체성, 집단성, 비인간화,

반체제

학 번 : 2010 - 23564